

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated January 7, 2009, Claims 1-15 of the present application were rejected. Herein, Claims 1-8 and 10-15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-15 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Further examination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Minor amendments to the specification have been made to correct various editorial and idiomatic errors. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0081159, hereafter “Gupta”) in view of McLaren et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,794, hereafter “McLaren”) and common knowledge within the networking art. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the remarks below.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a cited data detecting section operable to detect a cited part of the received video data or audio data that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail, as cited data, from the mail data received by the data receiving section. Gupta and McLaren fail to disclose or suggest this feature of Claim 1.

Gupta discloses using an interface module to assist a user in creating a new annotation within a media stream (Gupta [0096]-[0098]). The interface module assists the user by locating a beginning and/or end point for the annotation using a “thumb” along a time strip of the media stream. The media stream content as well as previous annotations are received by the user through a client/server networking system ([0009]). The temporal range located in the media content by the interface module corresponds to data created by a creator separate from the user/client interface, i.e. data created by the creator of the media content transmitted to the user from the server. Thus, Gupta fails to disclose or suggest a cited data detecting section operable to detect a cited part of the received video data or audio data **that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail**, as cited data from the mail data received by the data receiving section.

Further, McLaren was relied upon to disclose the reproduction control section controls the reproduction method so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail. McLaren does not disclose or suggest the above deficiency in Gupta, thus McLaren does not disclose or suggest a cited data detecting section operable to detect a cited part of the received video data or audio data that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail, as cited data, from the mail data received by the data receiving section.

Additionally, Claim 1 recites, in part, the reproduction control section controls the reproduction method so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail data. Gupta and McLaren fail to disclose or suggest this feature of Claim 1. In the rejection, it is admitted that Gupta does not disclose or suggest this feature. Therefore, McLaren is relied upon as addressing this deficiency of Gupta.

McLaren discloses the user controlled playback speed of video material (McLaren, Col.5, Lines 45-50). Thus, the playback speed of video content is determined not by data type (e.g. cited data from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail) but from arbitrary user selection. Therefore, McLaren fails to disclose or suggest the reproduction control section controls the reproduction method so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail data.

Based on the amended limitations and the above remarks, the Applicant believes Claim 1 is patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren.

Further, Claims 2-7 are patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren based at least on their dependency from allowable Claim 1.

Independent Claim 8 is patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren for reasons similar to those set forth above in support of Claim 1. That is, Claim 8 recites, in part, detecting a cited part of the video data or audio data that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail, as cited data from the received mail, which

feature is not disclosed or suggested by Gupta and McLaren.

Additionally, Claim 8 recites, in part, reproducing the cited data detected from the received mail data and data other than the cited data in the received mail data in different methods, which feature is not disclosed or suggested by Gupta and McLaren.

Further, Claims 9-14 are patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren based at least on their dependency from allowable Claim 8.

Independent Claim 15 is patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren for reasons similar to those set forth above in support of Claim 1. That is, Claim 15 recites, in part, a cited data detecting section operable to detect a cited part of the received video data or audio data that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail, as cited data from the received mail data, which feature is not disclosed or suggested by Gupta and McLaren.

Additionally, Claim 15 recites, in part, a reproduction control section controls a reproduction method of the received mail so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail data, which feature is not disclosed or suggested by Gupta and McLaren.

Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, it is submitted that independent Claims 1, 8, and 15, as well as the claims depending therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tetsuyuki NAKAYASU

/Stephen W. Kopchik/
2009.05.06 09:33:15 -04'00'
By: _____
Stephen W. Kopchik
Registration No. 61,215
Attorney for Applicant

SWK/DMO/rgf
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 6, 2009